

**REMARKS**

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Final Office Action dated October 27, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

**Summary of Rejections**

Claims 1-28 and 30-33 were pending at the time of the Final Office Action.

Claims 1-8, 28, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 USC § 102.

Claims 9-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103.

Claims 1-8, 13-14, 28, and 30-33 were objected.

**Summary of Response**

Claims 1, 9, 13, 14, and 28 are currently amended.

Claims 2, 3, 10-12, 23, and 31 were previously presented.

Claims 4-8, 15-22, 24-27, and 32-33 remain as originally submitted.

Claim 29 was previously canceled.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

**Summary of Claims Pending**

Claims 1-28 and 30-33 are currently pending following this response.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank Examiner Abedin for the allowance of claim 30. While Applicants have not rewritten dependent claim 30 in independent form, Applicants reserve the right to do so at a later time.

**Applicant Initiated Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Shanto Abedin for his time and consideration of the arguments presented in the telephone interview on December 22, 2009. In the interview Applicants discussed that the applied art does not teach or suggest that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with new invocations from one of the applications to another. Examiner Abedin suggested incorporating some of the language from the preamble into the body of the independent claims. Thus, in the interest of advancing prosecution, the claims have been amended herein as suggested by Examiner Abedin. Also, in the interview Examiner Abedin requested that the Silhavy reference be addressed in regard to any amendments. Therefore, Applicants note that Silhavy has been specifically addressed with regard to the amendments in the response to rejections section to claim 9 (i.e., section II below).

**Response to Rejections**

Boydston does not disclose and Upton in view of Bhatia further in view of Silhavy, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application. By not having a continuing context or session,

platform and application independent tokens are created, which permits the authentication of users in a heterogeneous computing environment and mitigates the need for an application to be authenticated and authorized every time it sends a message to another application.

The systems and methods of the pending application includes a security application program interface, an authentication authority, a store maintaining data, an application program interface, and a server application. The system and methods of the pending application provides a lightweight solution to enforcing security for communications between disparate applications executing on different platforms that does not require each application to be reprogrammed to include an application interface for each individual application with which it must communicate. The system and methods of the pending application provides for platform and application independent tokens to be passed among disparate applications residing on different platforms so that security information can automatically be included with each call from one application to another. This mitigates the need for an application to be authenticated and authorized every time it sends a message to another application. Thus, in contrast with services where a security context remains present on a server, the claims of the pending application provided security for applications in which there is no permanent context or session. Instead, a new context is created with new invocations from one application to another.

With regard to the art rejections, the Final Office Action has cited Boydstun, U.S. Patent No. 7,334,254 B1 ("Boydstun"); Upton, U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0097574 A1 ("Upton"); Bhatia et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,249,375 B2 ("Bhatia"); and Silhavy, et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0108521 A1 ("Silhavy"). Boydstun is directed to a system for controlling access to

computing resources within an enterprise. Upton relates to systems and methods for integration adapter security. Bhatia is directed to systems and methods for single sign-on to Web-based applications. Silhavy relates to systems and methods of performing single sign-on authentication when establishing a connection to a database. None of the applied art teaches or suggests that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.

These distinctions, as well as others, will be discussed in greater detail in the analysis of the present claims that follows.

### **Response to Objections**

Claims 1-8, 13-14, 28, and 30-33 were objected to because of informalities. Specifically, claims 1-8, 28, and 30-33 were objected because of potential 35 USC 101 issues. Applicants note that claims 1 and 28 have been amended as suggested by Examiner Abedin in the interview. In particular, claims 1 and 28 have been amended to include a first computer and a second computer. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and support for the amendments may be found in at least paragraphs 0039-0050. As indicated by Examiner Abedin, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments to claims 1 and 28 resolve any potential 35 USC 101 issues in regard to claims 1-8, 28, and 30-33.

Also, claims 13 and 14 were objected to because informalities. Specifically, the Office Action stated that "it was not clear" what claims 13 and 14 are claiming. Thus, Applicants have further clarified claims 13 and 14 as suggested by Examiner Abedin in the interview. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and

support for the amendments may be found in at least paragraphs 0013, 0015, and 0016. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to claims 1-8, 13-14, 28, and 30-33.

### **Response to Rejections under Section 102**

#### **Claim 1:**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boydstun, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 7,334,254 B1 (hereinafter, “Boydstun”).

I. Boydstun does not disclose that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.

Amended claim 1 recites “wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.” Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraph 0027.

Part of the limitation recited above was not previously addressed by the Office Action. However, the Office Action stated that column 6, lines 20-40 and column 8, starting at line 5 of Boydstun disclosed “wherein a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.”

Applicants respectfully submit that within the context of claim 1 as a whole, Boydstun does not disclose “wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.” Instead, Boydstun discloses using session tokens. For example, column

6, lines 31-35 of Boydstun discloses that “the second enterprise might request the security information and authenticate and authorize the first enterprise only one time and then *create a session token* that allows the first enterprise access to selected data *for the duration of the session*” (emphasis added).

Additionally, Applicants note the Office Action’s interpretation of column 6, lines 20-40 and column 8, starting at line 5 Boydstun. Specifically, the Office Action stated on page 5 that Boydstun teaches “creating new security information, or token each time user request[s] to access, or access[es] the second enterprise/server resources.” In contrast to the Office Action’s interpretation of Boydstun, claim 1 requires that there is no continuing context or session (i.e., a new token does not have to be created and the same token can be passed to different client applications). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Boydstun.

For at least the reasons established above in section I, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Boydstun and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

#### **Claims Depending from Claim 1:**

Claims 2-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boydstun.

Dependent claims 2-8 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in section I above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 are not anticipated by Boydstun and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

**Claim 28:**

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boydstun.

Newly amended claim 28 includes limitations substantially similar to the limitations discussed in section I above. For example, claim 28 now recites “wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the second application program interface by the first application program interface... wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the first application program interface by the second application program interface.” Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraph 0027. Accordingly, the arguments of section I are hereby repeated for claim 28.

For at least the reasons established above in section I, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 28 is not anticipated by Boydstun and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

**Claims Depending from Claim 28:**

Claims 31-33 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boydstun.

Dependent claims 31-33 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 28 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in section I above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-33 are not anticipated by Boydstun and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

**Response to Rejections under Section 103**

**Claim 9:**

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upton, U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0097574 A1 (hereinafter, “Upton”) in view of Bhatia, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,249,375 B2 (hereinafter, “Bhatia”) further in view of Silhavy, et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0108521 A1 (“Silhavy”).

II. Upton in view of Bhatia further in view of Silhavy, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.

Amended claim 9 recites “wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application.” Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraph 0027.

Part of the limitation recited above was not previously addressed by the Office Action. However, the Office Action stated that Upton discloses the preamble of claim 9, which includes limitations similar to the amendments made in the body of claim 9. Further, Applicants note that in the interview Examiner Abedin requested that Silhavy be addressed in regard to any amendments made. Therefore, both Upton and Silhavy are discussed below.

In regard to Upton, Applicants note that a text search for “token” in Upton produced only two results. (See paragraphs 104 and 150 of Upton). Neither result discloses that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application, as claimed. In fact, Applicants note that Upton merely discloses creating a single context each time



a user attempts to access a resource. For example, paragraph 102 of Upton discloses, “A security architecture can allow for the determination of entitlements as used within *an access context*...When a user attempts to access the resource, the security service can determine the type of access request, the destination (the protected resource), and *the context* in which the request is made” (emphasis added).

In regard to Silhavy, Applicants respectfully submit that Silhavy merely disclose creating a single context and a single session. For example, paragraph 0031 of Silhavy discloses that “[d]river 100 is then ready to create 330 and initialize 340 *a security context* for supporting secure communications between driver 100 and database instance 150” (emphasis added). In another example, paragraph 0033 discloses, “After *the security context* has been created 330, it is initialized 340 for communications...During *a computing session*, application 120 uses driver 100 to make requests of database 150 over secure connection 220, and replies are sent from database server 150 back through driver 100 to application 120” (emphasis added). In a last example, paragraph 0034 of Silhavy discloses, “*At the end of the session*, application 120 closes 350 connection 220 to the database” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Upton in view of Bhatia further in view of Silhavy, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with an invocation of the distinct server application by the client application. Applicants respectfully submit that Bhatia does not cure the deficiencies of Upton in view of Silhavy.

For at least the reasons established above in section II, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is not taught or suggested by Upton. Neither Bhatia

nor Silhavy, alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies of Upton. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this claim.

**Claims depending from Claim 9:**

Claims 10-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Upton in view of Bhatia further in view of Silhavy.

Dependent claims 10-27 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 9 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in section III above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-27 are not taught or suggested by Upton. Bhat and Bhatia, alone or in combination, do not cure the deficiencies of Upton. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 28, 2009

/Michael W. Piper/  
Michael W. Piper  
Reg. No. 39,800

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750  
Plano, Texas 75024  
(972) 731-2288  
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS